

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Vignia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	I	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/660,302		09/12/2000	Gerardus Jacobus Antonius Maria Strous	4075US	6944
24247	7590	09/26/2003			
TRASK BRITT				EXAMINER	
P.O. BOX 2550 SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84110				MCKELVEY, TERRY ALAN	
SALILAN	E CII I, (01 84110			
				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				· 1636	75
				DATE MAILED: 09/26/2003	<u> </u>
					/

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		·					
	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
	09/660,302	STROUS ET AL.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Terry A. McKelvey	1636					
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ting within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>01 J</u>	<u>uly 2003</u> .						
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ Th	is action is non-final.						
3) Since this application is in condition for alloward closed in accordance with the practice under							
Disposition of Claims							
4) Claim(s) 1-36 is/are pending in the application		ration					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.	4a) Of the above claim(s) 3-7,12-21,24,25 and 34 is/are withdrawn from consideration. Claim(s) is/are allowed						
	Claim(s)is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>1,2,8-11,22,23,26-33,35 and 36</u> is/are rejected.						
7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to.	•						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.						
Application Papers	orocaer oquii omomi						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.						
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accep	oted or b) objected to by the Exam	miner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	e drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on	is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disappro	ved by the Examiner.					
If approved, corrected drawings are required in rep							
12)⊠ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120							
13)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).					
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☒ None of:							
 Certified copies of the priority documents 	s have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been received in Application	on No					
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International But* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies of the prior application for a list of the certified copies of the prior application for a list of the certified copies of the prior application for a list of the certified copies of the prior application for a prior application for a list of the prior application for a list of the prior application for a list of the prior application from the the prior	reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	-					
14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e	e) (to a provisional application).					
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language pro 15)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domesti							
Attachment(s)	. , 55						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 5	5) Notice of Informal F	(PTO-413) Paper No(s) Patent Application (PTO-152)					
17 1 100							

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election without traverse of Group I, claims 1-2, 8-11, 22-23, 26-33, and 35-36 in Paper No. 22, filed 7/1/03 is acknowledged.

Claims 3-7, 12-21, 24-25, and 34 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made without traverse in Paper No. 22.

Oath/Declaration

The oath or declaration is defective. A new oath or declaration in compliance with 37 CFR 1.67(a) identifying this application by application number and filing date is required.

See MPEP §§ 602.01 and 602.02.

The oath or declaration is defective because: Non-initialed and/or non-dated alterations have been made to the oath or declaration. See 37 CFR 1.52(c).

In the instant case, a non-initialed and non-dated alteration has been made to the name of (Roland) Govers.

Specification

A substitute specification without the claims is required pursuant to 37 CFR 1.125(a) because the amendment filed 9/12/00 was too extensive to be entered into the specification.

A substitute specification filed under 37 CFR 1.125(a) must only contain subject matter from the original specification and any previously entered amendment under 37 CFR 1.121. If the substitute specification contains additional subject matter not of record, the substitute specification must be filed under 37 CFR 1.125(b) and must be accompanied by: 1) a statement that the substitute specification contains no new matter; and 2) a marked-up copy showing the amendments to be made via the substitute specification relative to the specification at the time the substitute specification is filed.

Claim Objections

Claims 27-32 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form.

Page 4

Application/Control Number: 09/660,302

Art Unit: 1636

Claims 27-32 attempt to further limit the claims they depend on by use or administration limitations. Use and coadministration limitations do not appear to further limit the claims because those limitations do not appear to result in an actual, structural limitation to the pharmaceutical compositions. In other words, because the pharmaceutical composition are what is actually being claimed, then limitations to how they are used, administered, or what they are administered with does not appear to affect the actual compositions themselves and thus they are not further limited in the dependent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claims 1-2, 8-11, 22-23, 26-33, and 35-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The claims are drawn to an inhibitor for regulating the availability or activity of a protein comprising a polypeptide that interferes with ubiquitin-proteasome system regulation of

cell surface receptors of a cell, a pharmaceutical composition comprising the inhibitor, and a method for controlling or upregulating the availability or activity of a protein by use of the inhibitor (including a non-polypeptide inhibitor). Thus, the claims are drawn to a genus of compounds (and a genus of a method using them) that is defined only by their function.

To provide adequate written description and evidence of possession of a claimed genus, the specification must provide sufficient distinguishing identifying characteristics of the The factors to be considered include disclosure of complete or partial structure, physical and/or chemical properties, functional characteristics, structure/function correlation, methods of making the claimed product, or any combination thereof. In the instant case, the only factor present in some of the claims is a slight structural limitation of the target site of the inhibitor, which is not a description of the actual structure of the inhibitor. The specification appears to indicate two types of preferred embodiments of the inhibitors are encompassed by the claimed invention: general proteasome inhibitors (which are encompassed in inhibitors used in the method claims of claims 1-2 and 8-9), such as MG132 and lactacystin, which are known and described in the prior art, and (for all claims) polypeptide inhibitors derived from, competes

Art Unit: 1636

with, or binds to an amino acid sequence located at or around a ubiquitin and/or ubiquitin/proteasome binding site. The second type of inhibitor is only described according to the target (or some unspecified derivation of the target), not the actual structure of the compounds encompassed by this type of inhibitor. The specification fails to describe the specific structure of even one compound of this type of inhibitor.

Accordingly, in the absence of sufficient recitation of distinguishing characteristics, the specification does not provide adequate written description of the claimed genus which encompasses the second type of inhibitor.

Vas-Cath Inc. v. Mahurkar, 19USPQ2d 1111, clearly states
"applicant must convey with reasonable clarity to those skilled
in the art that, as of the filing date sought, he or she was in
possession of the invention. The invention is, for purposes of
the 'written description' inquiry, whatever is now claimed."
(See page 1117.) The specification does not "clearly allow
persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that [he or
she] invented what is now is claimed." (See Vas-Cath at page
1116). As discussed above, the skilled artisan cannot envision
the detailed chemical structure of the encompassed genus of
inhibitors, and therefore conception is not achieved until
reduction to practice has occurred, regardless of the complexity

or simplicity of the method of isolation or identification.

Adequate written description requires more than a mere statement that it is part of the invention and reference to a potential method of isolating it. The compound itself is required. See Fiers v. Revel, 25USPQ2d 1601 at 1606 (CAFC 1993) and Amgen Inc. v. Chugai Pharmaceutical Co. Ltd., 18USPQ2d 1016.

One cannot describe what one has not conceived. See Fiddes v. Baird, 30 USPQ2d 1481 at 1483. In Fiddes, claims directed to mammalian FGF's were found to be unpatentable due to lack of written description for that broad class. The specification provided only the bovine sequence.

Therefore, only the first type of inhibitors (essentially the prior art inhibitors which are specifically listed in the specification), but not the full breadth of the claims meets the written description provision of 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Applicant is reminded that Vas-Cath makes clear that the written description provision of 35 U.S.C. 112 is severable from its enablement provision (see page 1115).

Claims 1-2, 8-11, 22-23, 26-33, and 35-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a

Art Unit: 1636

way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Enablement is considered in view of the Wands factors (MPEP 2164.01(a)). These include: nature of the invention, the state of the prior art, the predictability or lack thereof in the art, the amount of direction or guidance present, the presence or absence of working examples, the quantity of experimentation necessary, the relative skill levels of those in the art, and the breadth of the claim. The most relevant Wands factors for evaluating the enablement of the instant rejection are discussed below.

The claims are drawn to an inhibitor for regulating the availability or activity of a protein comprising a polypeptide that interferes with ubiquitin-proteasome system regulation of cell surface receptors of a cell, a pharmaceutical composition comprising the inhibitor, and a method for controlling or upregulating the availability or activity of a protein by use of the inhibitor (including a non-polypeptide inhibitor).

The nature of the invention is unpredictable because the specification does not set forth a description of the inhibitors as claimed, for the reasons described above.

Art Unit: 1636

The state of the prior art and predictability in the art is that polypeptide inhibitors based upon a polypeptide binding site are not predictable based upon the structure of the binding site, but instead must be determined empirically for any given protein or protein system because protein structures are not predictable from a function or activity of the protein in the absence of additional information.

There are no working examples of polypeptide inhibitors as claimed in either the specification or the prior art.

Although there is some slight guidance concerning polypeptide inhibitors that are claimed: "polypeptide inhibitors derived from, competes with, or binds to an amino acid sequence located at or around a ubiquitin and/or ubiquitin/proteasome binding site", this guidance is negligible because it is not guidance to the actual structures of the polypeptide inhibitors as claimed, but instead it is guidance to the compounds that are to be tested for activity, and as such, it is not actual guidance as to how to make the claimed inhibitors.

Therefore, in order to make the claimed invention, which is also needed for using the claimed invention, one skilled in the art would have to perform unpredictable experimentation to make the claimed inhibitors because neither the art nor the

specification teaches a description of the inhibitors, from among the essentially unlimited number of possible polypeptides such that one can make the claimed invention. Such unpredictable experimentation would be undue in the absence of any description of the structures of the claimed inhibitors and in view of the state of the art and unpredictability in the art.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 26-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention.

The claims are drawn to a pharmaceutical composition comprising a polypeptide inhibitors which interferes with ubiquitin-proteasome system regulation of cell surface receptors of a cell, which, from the specification, said polypeptides are derived from, competes with, or binds to an amino acid sequence

Application/Control Number: 09/660,302 Page 11

Art Unit: 1636

located at or around a ubiquitin and/or ubiquitin/proteasome binding site.

The only disclosed use for these compositions is for treatment of hormonal related or other diseases, such as treating patients with hormone deficiencies, or for treating muscle wasting caused by many different diseases.

The nature of the invention is very complex because it is a composition that is to be used to treat hormonal-related illness. Hormonal regulation in organisms is a very complex process which affects many different parts of the organism's body. Although there exists some treatments for some hormonal-related diseases, such as hormonal replacement therapy, there are no general or specific treatments based upon administration of a polypeptide that binds to a ubiquitin-proteasome system binding site.

The state of the prior art is that there is no teaching in the prior art of the same type of polypeptide inhibitors to treat any disease, let alone complex hormone related diseases.

Neither the art nor the specification teaches a working example of administration of the claimed pharmaceutical composition to a patient that successfully treats any disease.

There is no guidance in the prior art and only slight, prophetic generic guidance in the specification concerning how

Application/Control Number: 09/660,302 Page 12

Art Unit: 1636

to make and administer the claimed composition to treat disease. The specification merely teaches to administer the claimed polypeptide inhibitor, such as along with hormone treatment. The specification does not disclose, beyond a very generic description, the intended patients, and amounts of the composition to be administered for specific diseases. example, the specification fails to teach how to specifically make and use the claimed composition for the treatment of muscle wasting versus treatment of hormonal deficiency, such as estrogen deficiency, two very different diseases that presumably would require very different pharmaceutical formulations and administration methods. This overall guidance is very slight because it can be considered to be merely speculative because the effective use of a compound having in vitro biological activity, as a drug to treat a disease, is extremely unpredictable as taught by Caldwell.

Caldwell is cited to show the unpredictability in the art concerning how to make and use a drug. Caldwell teaches that drug action is the result of interaction with target sites, for both desired and undesired actions, modulated by the transfer processes, the pharmacokinetic variables of absorption, distribution, metabolism and elimination, by which the drug enters and leaves the body. This reference teaches that there

is far more inter- and intraspecies variation, in animals and humans, in the factors influencing the nature and extent of internal exposure, than in the sensitivity of drug targets and this pharmacokinetic variability is the cause of major problems in drug development. Caldwell also teaches that failure to take these pharmacokinetic defects, including poor absorption, very short or very long half-life, enzyme induction and high first pass effect, into consideration can cause expensive delay and/or failure during development. This reference thus shows that drug development is very unpredictable, requiring the consideration of many unpredictable factors in determining how to make and use These very necessary, but unpredictable factors are not taught in either the art or the specification for the specific administration of the claimed composition in vivo for disease treatment, the only intended use for the claimed pharmaceutical compositions.

In view of the large quantity of experimentation necessary to determine the unpredictable parameters necessary for the pharmaceutical composition to function successfully in vivo, the lack of significant direction or guidance presented, the absence of working examples, the breadth of the claims which includes the treatment of very different diseases, and the unpredictable and undeveloped state of the art with respect to formulating a

Application/Control Number: 09/660,302 Page 14

Art Unit: 1636

polypeptide that affects the ubiquitin-proteasome system regulation of cell surface receptors of a cell into a functional drug that can treat a specific disease in vivo, it would require undue experimentation for one skilled in the art to practice the claimed invention.

Amending the claim to recite "A composition comprising ...

" (i.e., removing reference to pharmaceutical), would be remedial in overcoming only the instant rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- (e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American

Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual

Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do

not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly

Art Unit: 1636

or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claims 1-2 and 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Fenteany et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,756,764).

Fenteany et al teach compounds related to lactacystin and lactacystin beta-lactone and pharmaceutical compositions containing the compounds (columns 1-11). This reference teaches that these compounds are highly selective inhibitors of the X/MB1 subunit and alpha-chain of the proteasome (column 11), which proteasome degrades or processes ubiquitin-conjugated proteins (column 1). Fenteany et al teach administration of the compounds to cells which blocked TNF-alpha dependent degradation of IkB-alpha (column 68) which administration inherently controlled the availability or activity of a protein by regulating binding of a ubiquitin-proteasome system at a ubiquitin-proteasome binding site of the protein because inhibition of the proteasome affects how much proteasome is bound at a ubiquitin-proteasome binding site of the protein (and thus regulates binding). In other words, by inhibiting the proteasome, administration of the compounds taught by the reference inherently affected the availability or activity of

Art Unit: 1636

all proteins that are regulated by the proteasome-ubiquitin system, including transporter proteins such as Glut4 insulin regulated glucose transporter. The inherency of the reference teaching the claimed invention is also shown by applicant's admission (e.g. page 9 of the specification) that preferred embodiments of the claimed inhibitor include proteasome inhibitors such as lactacystin. The additional limitation of the claim drawn to the ubiquitin-proteasome binding site is inherent because that is the binding site that is naturally used in the ubiquitin-proteasome system.

Claims 1-2 and 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lee et al (Applicant reference marked as AA1 by the examiner).

Lee et al teach selective inhibitors of the proteasomedependent pathway of protein degradation, and administration of
those inhibitors to cells (abstract) which inherently controlled
the availability or activity of a protein by regulating binding
of a ubiquitin-proteasome system at a ubiquitin-proteasome
binding site of the protein because inhibition of the proteasome
affects how much proteasome is bound at a ubiquitin-proteasome
binding site of the protein (and thus regulates binding). In
other words, by inhibiting the proteasome, administration of the

Art Unit: 1636

compounds taught by the reference inherently affected the availability or activity of <u>all</u> proteins that are regulated by the proteasome-ubiquitin system, including transporter proteins such as Glut4 insulin regulated glucose transporter. The inherency of the reference teaching the claimed invention is also shown by applicant's admission (e.g. page 9 of the specification) that preferred embodiments of the claimed inhibitor include proteasome inhibitors such as lactacystin. The additional limitation of the claim drawn to the ubiquitin-proteasome binding site is inherent because that is the binding site that is naturally used in the ubiquitin-proteasome system.

Page 17

Conclusion

No claims are allowed.

Certain papers related to this application may be submitted to Art Unit 1636 by facsimile transmission. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notices published in the Official Gazette, 1156 OG 61 (November 16, 1993) and 1157 OG 94 (December 28, 1993) (see 37 C.F.R. § 1.6(d)). The official fax telephone number for the Group is 703-872-9306. NOTE: If Applicant does submit a paper by fax, the original signed copy should be retained by applicant or applicant's representative. NO

Art Unit: 1636

DUPLICATE COPIES SHOULD BE SUBMITTED so as to avoid the processing of duplicate papers in the Office.

Any inquiry concerning rejections or other major issues in this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Terry A. McKelvey whose telephone number is (703) 305-7213. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, except for Wednesdays, from about 7:30 AM to about 6:00 PM. A phone message left at this number will be responded to as soon as possible (i.e., shortly after the examiner returns to his office).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dr. Remy Yucel can be reached on (703) 305-1998.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

Terry A. McKelvey, Ph.D.

Jen a Miller

Page 18

Primary Examiner Art Unit 1636

September 23, 2003